

SUBJECT No. 3.

The Mysore Legislative Council.

- (1) Mr. K. Shankaranarayana Rao, Shimoga Municipality.
- (2) Messrs. Nadig, Bhima Rao and Appajaiya, Channagiri taluk
- (3) Messrs. S. R. Balakrishna Rao, Shimoga Municipality, C. Subba Rao, Shimoga District Board; and C. Vaman Rao, Nagar taluk.
- (4) Mr. V. Raghavachar, Pavagada taluk.

Summary of discussion.—(1) The present number of two members elected by the Representative Assembly to the Legislative Council is too small to adequately represent the provincial interests. For several reasons, the malnad districts of Kadur and Shimoga are unable to send up their own representatives to the Legislative Council. It is respectfully prayed that each of these two districts may be granted the privilege of electing a member to the Legislative Council.

(2) One member may be allowed to be elected by the Representative members of each district to the Legislative Council once in three years.

(3) The districts of Shimoga, Kadur and Chitaldrug may be formed into an electorate to return a Representative member to the Mysore Legislative Council.

A member may be elected from each district for the Mysore Legislative Council.

(4) It is requested that arrangements may be made to hold the election of members to the Legislative Council from the Representative Assembly in the same year in which the election of members is held.

SUBJECT No. 4.

Right of interpellation in the Legislative Council.

- (1) Messrs. C. Vamana Rao, Nagar taluk and K. Shankaranarayana Rao, Shimoga Municipality
- (2) Mr. C. B. Gopala Rao, Kolar Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—(1) Like all other Legislative bodies in India, our Legislative Council may be granted the right of interpellation. This privilege will be a great boon. As the Representative Assembly meets only once a year, this right if granted to the Assembly cannot be of much practical utility. As the Legislative Council meets oftener, the privilege will be of real use to the public.

(2) As it is essential for the Government to be in touch with the various matters which do not come to their notice officially, and in view of the fact that an independent press does not exist, the right of interpellation in the Legislative Council may kindly be granted.

SUBJECT No. 5.

State Budget to be discussed by the Legislative Council.

- Messrs. C. Vamana Rao Nagar taluk and K. Shankaranarayana Rao, Shimoga Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—The State Budget may be allowed to be discussed by the Legislative Council as in British India. This privilege will be of immense benefit to the public.

Paras (2), (3), and (4) of subject No. 2 were withdrawn as also subjects Nos. 4 and 5. The discussion was mainly confined to para (1) of subject No. 2. Mr. K. Shankaranarayana Rao represented that each district has its own peculiar conditions. For example, the districts of Shimoga and Kadur have their own characteristic features which are not shared by the districts of Mysore and Hassan. Again the members in the former districts laboured under

some special disadvantages. While the members of Mysore and Hassan districts can generally attend the meetings of the Representative Assembly, large numbers from the districts of Shimoga and Kodaikanal, the members sometimes have to be absent on account of the distance of their places from the capital. This would be a serious disadvantage at the time of the election of members of the Legislative Council. Mr. H. V. Rangaswami supported the representation and said that if a member was returned for each district, his constituents could influence his judgment more effectively than if he represented a larger number of districts. Competent non-official gentlemen may be found in each district and as this is an unanimous prayer of the Assembly, the Government may kindly be pleased to grant the concession.

Reply of Government.—Noted for consideration.

SUBJECT No. 6.

A Regulation for compulsory primary education.

- (1) Messrs. H. Subba Rao, Chitaldrug District Board and Md. Kabula Hussein Sahib, Anjuman-e-Himayathi Islamia, Molakalmuru.
(2) Mr. Sanjiva Rao, Chitaldrug taluk.

Summary of discussion.—(1) A Regulation may be passed at an early date for making primary education compulsory throughout the State. It may be brought into force in some selected localities and gradually extended to the whole State.

(2) The number of schools may be increased.

This was considered along with subject No. 7.

SUBJECT No. 7.

The Elementary Education Bill.

Messrs. S. R. Balakrishna Rao, Shimoga Municipality, Venkatesamiah and Padmanna, Nanjangud taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The Elementary Education Bill drafted by the Education Committee of the Economic Conference may be passed into Law. It is only an enabling Regulation and it may at first be enforced in selected places where full advantage of the existing schools is not availed of.

The members thanked the Government for having decided to introduce the system of Compulsory Education into the State, and generally approved of the principle of the Bill. They offered however certain suggestions regarding details. Messrs. Shankarnarayana Rao, Anniah Pandit and H. Subba Rao, were of opinion that if the Regulation was to apply in the case of girls also, the age limit might be lowered to ten instead of eleven in their case. Messrs. H. V. Rangaswami and S. Venkatesiah suggested that both in the case of boys and girls, the age limits of six and eleven might be fixed. Messrs. K. H. Ramiah and C. Srinivasa Rao, wanted the limits to be extended to twelve. Mr. S. Ramanna of Hassan suggested that the provisions of the Regulation should not be very rigorously worked and that the object should be to popularise the measure. But Messrs. K. H. Ramiah and C. Vasudeva Rao, were of opinion that there were far too many grounds for exemption from attendance and that in order that the bill might not